

REMARKS

The specification and Abstract have been amended to more accurately describe the invention by reciting that the active compound or compounds are only capable of rendering the first polymeric material "less soluble" in an aqueous alkali developer. See pages 3-6, 9, and 13. Since developers are alkaline, obviously the treated polymeric material of the first layer cannot be alkali "insoluble," but only "less soluble" in alkali as a result of being treated with the active compound or compounds.

Page 9 has been amended to correct a typing mistake; pages 22 to delete the reference to "samples" not otherwise described; page 23 to delete inappropriate language; page 25 to improve the text of Example 11 and to delete the table after line 20 because it is repetitious; and page 26 to delete the last line of the table since it is inconsistent with the text of Example 11 and to improve the text of Example 12. It is not believed that any new matter is being added and entry of the amendments is therefore requested.

In addition, the claims have been amended to avoid their rejection under §112, first and second paragraphs, again for clarity, and to more specifically claim applicants invention. It is believed the amended claims now comply with the requirements of §112, first and second paragraphs, and its withdrawal as grounds of rejection of the claims is therefore requested.

Amended main claims 1 and 23 now include the subject matter of claims 5 and 25, respectively, with a further definition of the active compound or compounds used to treat the polymeric material of the first layer. Support for these compounds can be found on page 15 of the specification.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23, 30-34, and 42-54 under 35 U.S.C. §102(E) for being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103 for being obvious over Pattel et al. (hereafter Pattel). In addition, claims 1-24, 28-39, and 42-54 were rejected under §102 for being anticipated by or under §103 for being obvious over Hauck et al. '494 (hereafter Hauck '494).

It is noted that none of claims 25-27 were rejected over either Pattel or Hauck '494. In this regard, the Examiner comments that this was because the Examples in the specification show that the claimed treatment temperatures and times have significant effects on the resulting thermally sensitive materials. Main claims 1 and 23 now include these times and temperatures as well as the active compounds used to treat the polymeric material of the first layer. It is these in combination that provide the significant effects. While the times and temperatures included in claim 1 were also set forth in claim 5 and claim 5 was rejected over Pattel and Hauck '494, it is believed the Examiner overlooked these limitations in claim 5 since no comment was made concerning them. On the contrary, the comment made was that they represented a distinguishing feature of the invention. See page 6, lines 7-12 of the Office Action.

Accordingly, it is believed claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-50 are in condition for allowance.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 3, 2005

By: 
Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338

Attachments: Replacement Abstract

847262_1